

CITY OF BOULDER, COLORADO
BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS MEETING SUMMARY FORM

NAME OF BOARD/COMMISSION: Greenways Advisory Committee
DATE OF MEETING: May 19, 2004
NAME/TELEPHONE OF PERSON PREPARING SUMMARY: Robin Madel, 303-441-4073
NAMES OF MEMBERS, COUNCIL, STAFF AND INVITED GUESTS PRESENT: COMMITTEE MEMBERS – Gil Barth, Krista Holland, Susan Iott, Linda Jourgenson, Simon Mole, Ed Von Bleichert STAFF – Annie Noble, Karen Medde, Betty Solek, Marni Ratzel, Mike Galuzzi (McLaughlin Water Engineers), Robin Madel
WHAT TYPE OF MEETING (BOLD ONE) [REGULAR] [SPECIAL] [QUASI-JUDICIAL]
Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.
Agenda Item 2 – Meeting minutes from Nov. 19, 2003. The meeting minutes were not addressed.
Agenda Item 3 – General Citizen Participation There was none. General Citizen Participation was closed.
Agenda Item 4 – Public hearing and GAC approval on the Elmer’s Twomile Community and Environmental Assessment Process (CEAP). Annie Noble reviewed the alternatives for Phase I and described the reasoning behind the staff recommendation. Noble took questions from the public and the GAC members. Questions covered specifics of path location, effects of the concrete lining on seepage and impacts to the wetland corridor and impacts to mature trees located along the creek. Noble then reviewed the alternatives for Phase II and the staff recommendation which includes the flexibility to work with the adjacent property owners to find the best solutions and to minimize impacts. Noble took questions from the public and the GAC. Questions covered specifics around Rayback Plumbing and Willowbrook Townhomes, path connections to commercial areas and adjacent residential areas, the height of the retaining wall required by the two alternatives, impacts to existing trees, impacts to flood control, the timeframe for this phase and the locations of the pathways compared to existing structures, especially Willowbrook Townhomes. Public Participation Comments were received from the following members of the public: <u>Troy Chronister</u>, 3150 Eastwood Ct., Boulder, <u>Clyda Stafford</u>, 3120 Eastwood Ct., Boulder, <u>Aaron Brockett</u>, 1336 Redwood Ave., Boulder, <u>Chad Marks</u>, 3141 Westwood Ct., Boulder, Discussion Phase I <u>Simon Mole</u> motioned to accept the Greenways construction recommendation for Alternative 1 for Phase I of the Elmer’s Twomile Creek CEAP. <u>Linda Jourgenson</u> seconded the motion. Discussion covered concerns about mature trees and the fact that there is not a clear sense of their management and replacement. The motion was amended. <u>Linda Jourgenson</u> amended the motion to read that every effort would be taken to preserve the natural amenities and habitat for the adjacent property owners.

The vote was 6-0 in favor of the motion.

Phase II

Simon Mole motioned to accept the staff recommendation for Alternative 2 for Phase II of the Elmer's Twomile Creek CEAP with flexibility to work with the adjacent property owners to find the best solutions and to minimize impacts.

Krista Holland seconded the motion.

Discussion included possible amendments to take into account all of the citizen and GAC concerns. The motion includes the following recommendations:

- **The staff will explore parking reductions in neighboring eastern properties and moving the northern part of the pathway to the east adjacent to Tebo Plaza and Glenwood Grove.**
- **The staff will explore all possible path connections to the eastern commercial properties from Tebo Plaza and Glenwood Grove.**
- **The staff will make all efforts to mitigate visual and sound impacts for property owners on the western side of the channel by constructing and installing vegetation and sound barriers on the east side of the path.**
- **The staff will maximize their outreach efforts during the design phase of the project.**
- **Staff will instruct the construction crew to the extent possible, to minimize construction related impacts, with as much construction access and work happening from the east side to limit impacts to the residents who live in Willowbrook Townhomes.**
- **The project team will take every effort to preserve the natural habitat for adjacent property owners, specifically including large, mature trees.**

The vote was 6-0 in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 5 – Public hearing and GAC recommendation on the Greenways 2005-2010 Capital Improvements Program (CIP).

Annie Noble discussed the specifics of the large amount of carryover in the CIP. There was concern about how much of the carryover is obligated and what the risk of losing the money is. There was concern especially over reallocating money designated for the weed maintenance program. The GAC requested keeping the money in place for another year or two to evaluate problems with weeds and the drought, consistency of management and the possibility of hiring a larger crew. The general feeling is that larger weed pulling crews should be hired earlier in the season when weeds are young and then a consistent crew could be kept through the summer.

A discussion also took place regarding funding sources. Annie indicated that there is a belief among some Open Space staff that the Lottery fund contribution to the Greenways budget is dedicated to habitat restoration and maintenance. While there had been criticism in the past (prior to the Greenways Master Plan) that not enough funding had been dedicated toward environmental restoration/preservation efforts, Annie could find no record of a requirement that the Lottery funding be dedicated for that purpose only. Annie explained that the Greenways Program has historically been viewed as opportunistic. The three funding sources (Lottery, Transportation and Flood) have been utilized to do a variety of projects that, overall, meet the objectives of the Program. An attempt is made to leverage funding with outside sources or complete projects in conjunction with projects being completed by other departments.

There was a question about the responsibility for maintenance of greenways properties. Also, the GAC wanted to know what the major needs of the program are and if the entire \$150K currently designated for the program could be spent. The GAC also asked to have some clarification about how the weed maintenance program fits into the overall city program. Noble said that she would discuss the questions with Nancy Steinberger, the former program manager that no longer works with the city.

Susan Iott motioned to approve the budget.

Gil Barth seconded the motion.

The vote was 6-0 in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 6 – Information item on the Habitat Maintenance Plan.

The item was informational only. The item was not discussed but the GAC members were told to transmit all of their questions about the plan to the GAC secretary.

Agenda Item 7 – A. Matters from Staff <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were none. B. Matters from the Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were none.
Agenda Item 8 – Adjournment The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.
Date, Time, and Location of Next Meeting: To be determined.